| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| 20. | Punjab | 2 |
| 21. | Rajasthan | 1 |
| 22. | Sikkim | 0 |
| 23. | Tamil Nadu | 4 |
| 24. | Tripura | 2 |
| 25. | Uttar Pradesh | 2 |
| 26. | Uttaranchal | 3 |
| 27. | West Bengal | 2 |
| | National average | 3 |

**Works under PMGSY not conforming standards**

1832. SHRI GIREESH KUMAR SANGHI: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Parliamentary Committee of his Ministry has pointed out that works under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana were executed by States without conforming to standard design and specifications spelt out in guidelines of programme;

(b) whether Government has revised the funding requirements of 1,32,150 crores in March, 2005;

(c) if so, whether at least Rs. 50 crores was spent in 17 States for providing connectivity to ineligible habitations and another Rs. 30 crores were spent of providing multi-connectivity;

(d) if so, the other main points mentioned by Parliamentary panel report in this regard; and

(e) to what extent Government has considered their suggestions and to what extent it has helped the Ministry?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SURYAKANTA PATIL): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Public Accounts Committee (PAC) of the Parliament, in its 72nd Report has pointed out that Rs. 4735.53 lakhs were spent in 17 States for providing connectivity to ineligible habitations, and an amount of Rs. 2891.69 lakhs was also spent in providing multi-connectivity in six States.

(d) The other main points mentioned by in this Report of Public Accounts Committee in this regard was on repairs to black topped or cement roads and construction of district roads in 9 States.

(e) The Ministry has taken following action in this regard:—

(i) **Inadmissible Connectivity**:— Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Meghalaya, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa, Punjab and Sikkim have been asked to fix responsibility for the omission.

(ii) **Multi-connectivity**:— In all the cases pointed out by Audit, except Tamil Nadu, the works pertain to Phase-I and II when the Core Network was not in place. During these two phases instances of multi-connectivity have been found. In Tamil Nadu there is a case of multi-connectivity in the III phase and the State has been asked to fix responsibility for the lapse.

(iii) As intimated by the States, the cases of repairs pointed by audit are actually cases of upgradation of through routes which is eligible for funding under the guidelines.

The Ministry has noted the suggestion of the Committee, which have been helpful in further improvement and streamlining of procedures.

**NREGA in Himachal Pradesh**

1833. SHRIMATI VIPLOVE THAKUR: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that earlier NREGA was implemented only in two Districts of Himachal Pradesh and later it was extended to two more districts only;

(b) if so, whether Government propose to implement of NREGA in rest of the districts of Himachal Pradesh;

(c) the names of districts in which Government plan to implement NREGA in near future;

(d) whether Government propose to implement NREGA in all the districts of Himachal Pradesh; and

(e) if so, the time limit stipulated by the Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI CHANDRA SEKHAR SAHU): (a) Yes, Sir. NREGA was implemented in Chamba and Sirmaur districts of Himachal Pradesh with effect from 2.2.2006 and two more districts namely Mandi and Kangra were included under the Act with effect from 1.4.2007.

(b) to (e) All the remaining rural areas of Himachal Pradesh have been covered under NREGA with effect from 1.4.2008.

**Non-inclusion of Madhubani in flood affected area in Bihar**

†1834. SHRI RAJNITI PRASAD: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.